QUESTIONS AND RESPONSES

NUMBERS 140 - 162

140. Why are the Nickel Ingots currently classified material and will they have to be de-classified as part of any recycling process? What is the basis for the classification? Smelting of the material into Ingots was supposed to render the Nickel material unclassified.

Answer: The contractor is to assume the nickel is classified and will require declassification as part of processing. DOE can not provide additional details at this time due to the classified nature of the material.

141. What is the current status of the DOE Recycling Moratorium being lifted?

Answer: The contractor is to assume that the existing moratorium will remain in place.

142. Can the Contractor, under the current DOE Recycling Moratorium, recycle material from the facilities for reuse as original intent, if surveyed and found uncontaminated: i.e. Transformers shipped for use to vendors as intact transformers; or copper bus bar & cable?

Answer: Materials that meet the DOE requirements for free release under DOE O 435.1 and DOE O 5400.5 can be recycled.

143. Do sump and basement slabs have to be fractured prior to backfill placement?

Answer: Yes. Fracturing or holing is a standard process to ensure drainage and to prevent float. The Contractor is expected to take the necessary and appropriate actions to leave the site in a stable condition.

144. The PWS states that demolition of facilities is to slab or grade. Is the Contractor to perform any survey for release of the concrete and decontamination, if necessary, prior to leaving or backfill placement to bring to grade?

Answer: Per Section C.1.10.3k) of the RFP, the Contractor shall perform radiological surveys as needed for their work. The Contractor is responsible for performing necessary radiological surveys and work to ensure that remaining slabs are left in a state to prevent release of any remaining radiological contamination and are appropriately marked and protected.

145. Can the Transite siding from the C410/420 Complex and other facilities be disposed of in the existing Onsite Disposal Cells?

Answer: Yes. Asbestos transite siding can be disposed in the C-746-U solid waste landfill as long as it meets radiological authorized limits for the landfill.

146. Are the structural steel framework, transite panels, and/or concrete slabs contaminated with beryllium in the C410/420 Complex?

Answer: Beryllium is not considered a contaminant of concern in the C-410/420 Complex.

147. Have all of the HF and Slurry Tanks within the C410/420 Complex been drained and are empty?

Answer: The C-410 tank farm has been dismantled and disposed.

148. Section C.1.3.2, D&D of Inactive Facilities—Does DOE know how many, and if any, which buildings/structures have classified equipment in them, and will DOE list those to the contractors prior to award of contract?

Answer: C-746-A and C-746-B have classification concerns.

149. Does the C-340 Complex have any classified material within the facility?

Answer: C-340 is currently operating under an approved security plan that allows access by un-cleared personnel.

150. Is the Contractor the Authority Having Jurisdiction (AHJ) on the various systems involved in D&D Facilities and Waste Operations, such as Fire Protection System, Electrical, Structural RCAAS, etc.?

Answer: No. DOE serves as the Authority Having Jurisdiction.

151. Please clarify what is included in the 14 non-discriminating activities for which DOE has provided costs [RFP Section L.5(f)(4)(B)] so we do not double count activities and costs for those activities.

Answer: DOE has posted the estimated number of Full Time Equivalents (FTEs) and estimated major cost elements associated with the DOE provided costs on the Paducah Remediation web page under the Reference Document link in the Paducah Environmental Remediation Project - General section.

152. We respectfully request that DOE clarify the discrepancy in the RFP between the text in C.1.2 and Table C.1.2(c) regarding when the TRU and MTRU wastes must be disposed. The text within C.1.2, Work To Be Performed, b), states: “Store, characterize, process, package, and ship TRU/MTRU waste. The waste shall be disposed as MLLW/LLW by 9/30/11 if processed and packaged waste is less than 100 nCi/gram transuranics, otherwise if it remains as TRU/MTRU it shall be disposed at the Waste

Isolation Pilot Plant by the end of the contract period of performance. TRU/MTRU waste disposition and shipping schedules shall be coordinated with the Carlsbad Field Office and the Advanced Mixed Waste Treatment Facility in Idaho." Table C.1.2(c), indicates: Disposition all TRU and MTRU Waste by 9/30/11.

Answer: The MTRU waste requires stabilization treatment to meet RCRA land disposal restriction (LDR) requirements. Because many of the MTRU containers are marginally TRU (> 100 nCi/gram transuranics), the treatment to meet LDR requirements and subsequent repackaging is likely to result in dilution of container concentrations below TRU levels. Any containers that are below TRU levels after processing and packaging are to be dispositioned by 9/30/11. Any containers that remain TRU wastes after processing and packaging are to be sent to WIPP by the end of the contract period of performance.

153. Section C.1.2 e) states that the offeror should "Disposition all of the waste identified by the dates set forth in the Table C.1.2 (c) (milestone/schedule) below and in accordance with the latest Site Treatment Plan as applicable.' However, the latest version of the Site Treatment Plan PRS-WSD-0278 dated March 25, 2008 indicates that the due dates for disposition of the various legacy and newly generated waste streams (except TRU/MTRU) is 1/31/08. What due dates for disposition should be assumed for the proposal?

Answer: All legacy STP wastes (excluding MTRU) will be dispositioned by the current contractor by the revised STP compliance date of May 31, 2009 (letter from Kentucky Division of Waste Management to DOE and PRS, dated August 19, 2008). The new contractor will be responsible for disposition of newly generated MLLW generated by the current contractor after 6/30/09, and all newly generated MLLW generated by the new contractor, within one year of generation. The Site Treatment Plan Annual Update Report, due by March 31 each year, discusses the prior calendar year's activities. Any MLLW that is both generated and dispositioned within that calendar year is not included in the Annual Update Report. Any newly generated MLLW that is not dispositioned within the calendar year will be reported in the Annual Update Report and will have a compliance date of one year after generation, unless a different date is negotiated with KDWM. The letter from Kentucky Division of Waste Management to DOE and PRS, dated August 19, 2008 has been posted on the Paducah Remediation web page under the Reference Document link in the Waste Disposition section.

154. Reference: C.1.9 Burial Grounds Operable Unit (BGOU). This work scope shall be considered complete following submittal and approval of all regulatory documents (e.g., Proposed Plan, ROD, Remedial Design Report, Land Use Control Implementation Plan) allowing implementation of the remedial action, field mobilization, and completion of at least 15% of the remedial action fieldwork.

Question: Given that the Burial Grounds Operable Unit Feasibility Study is not complete (scheduled to be approved by September 30, 2009), each offeror's technical approach to remedial action fieldwork could be different. Because differing remedial actions

within SWMUs (soil cover, excavation, treatment) will have dramatically different cost impacts, how will DOE quantify the specified 15% completion of the remedial action field work? In order to facilitate fair and reasonable evaluation, will DOE provide a non-discriminating dollar value for all bidders as the metric for "completion of at least 15% of the remedial action fieldwork"? This approach should allow for an equitable and less time-consuming evaluation of proposals.

Answer: Offerors are required to manage the lifecycle baseline for remediation work at Paducah. Based on the information available in the Remedial Investigation Report, the current lifecycle baseline supplied to the Offerors, and the Offeror's own methodology for accomplishing the burial ground scope, the Offerors are responsible for determining the 15% of the remedial action fieldwork to be completed.

155. D&D of the C-410/420 Complex. The RFP states "This scope shall be considered complete following deactivation, decontamination, demolition and disposition of all material associated with the D&D of the C-410/420 Complex site restoration; and submittal of a final Removal Action Completion Report."

"The C-410/420 Complex houses process equipment and various support systems."

"The Complex was shutdown in 1977 and utilized for storage." (C-410/420 Complex)

Question – Will DOE provide the necessary information to identify the "process equipment and various support systems" that are presently remaining in the Complex as well as the equipment that is stored in the Complex? This information will be essential to a determination of the work scope involved in removal, packaging and disposition of the systems, components and materials presently stored in the Complex buildings and structures. The RFP reference documents do not presently include this necessary level of detail. The types of information that would be needed to support the estimating and scheduling of the element of the work scope should include:
NOTE – the Table A.1 of the 2001 EE/CA for the C-410/420 Complex contains a generic listing of components and provides volumetric information but lacks sufficient detail to support the planning and removal of the components.

- System descriptions and details sufficient to determine the scope of removal operations (component locations, mountings, weights, piping runs, electrical services etc.)
- Chemical and radiological characterization of the remaining systems, components and materials (both external and internal)
- The operational status of equipment and components (i.e. were they shutdown and left "as is", were they flushed and drained and laid up, or is the status unknown)
- The status of installed lifting and handling equipment within the Complex buildings and structures. (i.e. are overhead hoists and cranes operational and under maintenance or are they abandoned in place with unknown status)

Answer: Available information has been provided in the following documents to address bullets one, two, and three above. Refer to:

· DOE/OR/07-1952&D2/R1, Engineering Evaluation/Cost Analysis for the C-410 Complex Infrastructure D&D Project at the Paducah Gaseous Diffusion Plant, Paducah, Kentucky" (December 2001)

· DOE/OR/07-2012&D2, Removal Action Work Plan for the C-410 Complex Infrastructure D&D Project at the Paducah Gaseous Diffusion Plant, Paducah, Kentucky" (October 2002)

· Engineering and architectural drawings

Current radiological survey data for the C-410/420 complex has also been provided. Lifting equipment and elevators in the C-410/420 complex were abandoned in place.

156. D&D of the C-410/420 Complex. Question – Will DOE provide information regarding constraints to building demolition that could impact the selection of demolition methodology? Examples:

- Are there overhead or underground power lines that would constrain either access to all sides of the structures or the conduct of active building demolition processes?
- Are there active site fluid and/or process lines that pass near, over, beneath or through the complex structures that would have to be addressed during building demolition operations?

Answer: Per the provided lease map, the C-410/420 Complex sits centrally amid the operating Gaseous Diffusion Plant. Underground and above ground active utilities and process lines and nearby operating facilities will be a necessary consideration in selecting demolition methodology. See also the response to #155. The Contractor will be responsible for coordinating with United States Enrichment Corporation via the Shared Site process on interface points and surrounding infrastructure.

157. D&D of the C-340 Complex. The RFP states "This scope shall be considered complete following deactivation, decontamination, demolition and disposition of all material associated with the D&D of the C-340 Complex site restoration; and submittal of a final Removal Action Completion Report." The RFP is silent in terms of addressing any remaining equipment and systems that may still be present within the Complex.

Question – Will DOE provide the necessary information to identify any process equipment and various support systems that are presently remaining in the Complex as well as the equipment that may be stored in the Complex? This information will be essential to a determination of the work scope involved in removal, packaging and disposition of the systems, components and materials presently stored in the Complex buildings and structures. The RFP reference documents do not presently include this necessary level of detail. The types of information that would be needed to support the estimating and scheduling of the element of the work scope should include:

- System descriptions and details sufficient to determine the scope of removal operations (component locations, mountings, weights, piping runs, electrical services etc.)
- Chemical and radiological characterization of the remaining systems, components and materials (both external and internal)
- The operational status of equipment and components (i.e. were they shutdown and left “as is”, were they flushed and drained and laid up, or is the status unknown)
- The status of installed lifting and handling equipment within the Complex buildings and structures. (i.e. are overhead hoists and cranes operational and under maintenance or are they abandoned in place with unknown status)

Answer: Available information has already been provided. Refer to the C-340 video and engineering drawings already provided for information on process equipment and systems. Current radiological survey data for the C-340 complex has also been provided. Lifting equipment and elevators in the C-340 complex were abandoned in place. Additional facility information is provided in Safety *Analysis Document for the C-340 Complex (A/B/C/D/E)* that has been added to the list of reference documents available on the website.

158. D&D of the C-340 Complex. Question – Will DOE provide information regarding constraints to building demolition that could impact the selection of demolition methodology? Examples:

- Are there overhead or underground power lines that would constrain either access to all sides of the structures or the conduct of active building demolition processes?
- Are there active site fluid and/or process lines that pass near, over, beneath or through the complex structures that would have to be addressed during building demolition operations?

Answer: Refer to the provided lease map for the C-340 location relative to the operating facilities of the Gaseous Diffusion Plant. C-340 is separated from the operating facilities by a fence. The Contractor will be responsible for coordinating with United States Enrichment Corporation via the Shared Site process on interface points and surrounding infrastructure.

159. Looking at the Paducah RFP I do not see that the Prime contractor is required to utilize USEC? It this correct?

Answer: USEC provides Government-Furnished Services and Items (GFSI) on behalf of DOE in accordance with Section H of the RFP. Whether to utilize USEC for non-GFSI is at the discretion of the remediation contractor. Additionally, Section C of the RFP requires the Contractor to integrate all activities with ongoing USEC operations in areas of joint interface, and to support DOE with respect to the Lease Agreement between DOE and USEC.

160. According to Q&A # 76 "For proposal preparation purposes, the Offerors shall use a disposal unit rate of $14.51/cft for any LLW and MLLW that they plan to ship to the Nevada Test Site for disposal." However, in the WBS Dictionaries that were posted on the EMCBC website on Friday, for the C.1.3 Facilities Disposition WBS elements, the assumption is made "NTS remains direct funded (no per cubic foot tipping fee) for the duration of this project." Based on the waste volumes for Facilities Disposition provided in the RFP, the disposition cost for just the LLW and MLLW would be 2,110,000 cft x $14.51/cft = $30.6 M. Does the Anticipated Funding Profile for Paducah Remediation provided in Table L.2 in the RFP include these additional $s for disposition at NTS? If not, are we still expected to develop our cost estimate to reflect the funding profile?

Answer: The funding profile does include disposal fees. Each Offeror shall determine the disposal location and fees that best aligns with their technical approach.

161. By requiring an L-7 sheet at one level below the PWS this will create approximately 200 L-7 sheets. Is this the intent of DOE?

Answer: For proposal evaluation purposes, DOE requires L-7 sheets at one level below the PWS.

162. As defined by the Association of for the Advancement of Cost Engineering (AACE) “A parametric estimate comprises cost estimating relationships and other parametric estimating functions that provide logical and repeatable relationships between independent variables, such as design parameters or physical characteristics and the dependent variable, cost.” As such a parametric estimate uses information about the assumed characteristic of a piece of work such as the size a structure to develop a complete cost. It does not provide for a detail of effort by labor type and a breakdown of the non-labor costs by equipment, materials, supplies and subcontract. Will DOE allow the use of such that the resultant cost is categorized as an other direct cost (ODC)?

Answer: No. Please see the answer to question 100 which states "Although parametric estimating is allowed under Section L.5(f)(4)(A)(ii), parametric estimates are only to be used within a cost categories. Parametric estimating that cross-cuts cost elements is not acceptable."